IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

CRIMINAL ACTION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 11-186-S

VS. NOVEMBER 19, 2012

JOSEPH CARAMADRE and

RAYMOUR RADHAKRISHNAN PROVIDENCE, RI

HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM E. SMITH

DISTRICT JUDGE

(Changes of Plea)

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE GOVERNMENT:

LEE VILKER, AUSA and JOHN P. McADAMS, AUSA U.S. Attorney's Office

50 Kennedy Plaza

Providence, RI 02903

FOR THE DEFENDANT

Joseph Caramadre: MICHAEL J. LEPIZZERA, ESQ.

Lepizzera & Laprocina 117 Metro Center Blvd.

Suite 2001

Warwick, RI 02886

ANTHONY M. TRAINI, ESQ.

56 Pine Street

Providence, RI 02903

APPEARANCES: (Continued)

FOR THE DEFENDANT

Raymour Radhakrishnan: OLIN THOMPSON, ESQ.

Federal Defender's Office

10 Weybosset St.

Providence, RI 02903

Court Reporter: Anne M. Clayton, RPR

Anne M. Clayton, RPR One Exchange Terrace Providence, RI 02903

Proceeding reported and produced by computer-aided stenography

19 NOVEMBER 2012 -- 9:20 A.M. 1 2 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. 3 Counsel, are we ready to proceed on the basis of 4 our conversations this morning? MR. LEPIZZERA: Yes, your Honor. 5 6 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right, then. My understanding 8 is from my conversations with all counsel that the 9 Defendants have made a decision to change their pleas 10 in this case so we're going to proceed on that basis. 11 Before we begin, Mr. Radhakrishnan, I understand 12 that you wish to have Mr. Thompson take over the role 13 as your counsel at this point; is that correct? 14 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. Then I'm going to ask 16 both Defendants, Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan, 17 to please stand and be sworn in by the clerk. 18 JOSEPH A. CARAMADRE and RAYMOUR RADHAKRISHNAN, 19 first having been duly sworn, testified as follows: 20 THE CLERK: Please state your name and spell 21 your last name for the record. 22 THE COURT: Begin with Mr. Caramadre. 23 MR. CARAMADRE: Joseph Caramadre, C-A-R-A-M-A-D-R-E. 24 25 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Raymour Radhakrishnan.

Radhakrishnan is R-A-D-H-A-K-R-I-S-H-N-A-N.

THE COURT: Mr. Lepizzera, would you just move the microphone closer to Mr. Caramadre so that each of the Defendants has a microphone in front of them.

The way we're going to proceed, gentlemen, is that I'm going to go through a series of questions. I'm going to ask the questions of each of you. I'm going to ask that you both answer the questions out loud one after the other. Mr. Caramadre, you'll go first; and Mr. Radhakrishnan, you'll go second. All right? But we'll do this together.

So you've both been sworn in. I'm going to ask you a series of questions. You're expected to answer all of my questions truthfully. If you fail to answer any of my questions truthfully, it could lead to additional charges against you for perjury or for making a false statement. Do both of you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: State your names again, please.

MR. CARAMADRE: Joseph Caramadre.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Raymour Radhakrishnan.

THE COURT: How far did you go to school?

MR. CARAMADRE: Graduated from law school, your

1 Honor. 2 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: I finished undergraduate 3 school and had a semester at law school, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Have either of you been treated 5 recently for any mental illness or addiction to 6 narcotic drugs? 7 Your Honor, I have been treated MR. CARAMADRE: 8 for mental depression, both lately and for the last 20 9 years. 10 Excuse me, your Honor, if I may. I MR. TRAINI: have with me a list of Mr. Caramadre's medications so 11 12 that we don't have to go through them. 13 THE COURT: Sure. Could you just bring that up. 14 MR. TRAINI: The Government has seen this, your 15 Honor. 16 THE COURT: And we can just confirm, with 17 respect to Mr. Caramadre, that you fully understand all 18 the proceedings that are going on here, correct? 19 MR. CARAMADRE: That is correct, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: And nothing in terms of these 21 medications would have any effect on your ability to 22 comprehend what's going on here? 23 MR. CARAMADRE: No. sir. 24 THE COURT: And counsel can just confirm that,

25

please.

1 MR. TRAINI: Yes, your Honor. That's correct. THE COURT: All right. 2 3 Now, Mr. Radhakrishnan, what about you? MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: I do not have any medical 4 conditions, your Honor. 5 6 THE COURT: We covered the medications you're 7 taking, Mr. Caramadre. Beyond that, are either of you 8 under the influence of any drugs or medications or 9 alcoholic beverages of any kind? 10 MR. CARAMADRE: No, your Honor. 11 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: No, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Both of you have seen a copy of the 13 Government's charges against you in this case; is that 14 right? 15 MR. CARAMADRE: That's correct, your Honor. 16 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: And you both had a full opportunity 18 to discuss all of these charges against you with your 19 counsel; is that right? 20 MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor. 21 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: And you have each now signed a plea 23 agreement in this case; is that correct? 24 MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor. 25 MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And did each of you have a full opportunity to discuss all of the charges against you and the plea agreements and the consequences of these plea agreements with your counsel before you signed the plea agreements? MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor. MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Now are each of you fully satisfied -- first of all, were your counsel able to answer all of your questions regarding all of the charges and the terms of these plea agreements with you? MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor. MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And are both of you fully satisfied with all of the representation that you've received in this case from your respective counsel? MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor. MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Now, has anyone made any promises to you of any kind in order to get you to -- other than what's contained in the plea agreement, of course, in order to get you to plead guilty in these cases? No, your Honor. MR. CARAMADRE: MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you in any way

to get you to plead guilty?

MR. CARAMADRE: No, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: You understand that these plea agreements, essentially, are recommendations to the Court. I may accept those recommendations or I may choose not to. If I don't accept those recommendations, you don't get to take back your plea of guilty once you enter your plea today.

Let me give a caveat to that. These are pleas under Rule 11C, and I'll go over the terms of that in a moment. So it's understood that the potential sentence in this case is capped at ten years and that's in the plea agreement. But other than that, you understand that these are recommendations and I may accept them or not accept them; but if I don't accept anything that's recommended in the plea agreement, you don't get to take back your plea of guilty once you enter it today. Do you understand that.

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor. I understand.

THE COURT: Now, you understand, both of you, that the offenses that you're pleading guilty to are felony offenses and if I accept these pleas and you're

adjudged to be guilty of these offenses, it could result in the loss of certain valuable civil rights that you enjoy such as the right to vote, the right to serve on a jury, the right to hold public office, the right to possess a firearm. You both understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

agreements are made pursuant to Rule 11C, which means the Court is agreeing to certain things in the plea agreement with respect to the penalty. And I have decided -- I've reviewed these agreements and I've consulted with counsel and I've decided to accept the plea agreements. And so with respect to the penalties, I'm going to go through the statutory penalties with you, but then I'm going to state what the agreement says the penalty that has been -- the cap on the penalty that's been agreed to and that I've agreed to. All right?

So the maximum statutory penalties for the two counts that you're pleading guilty to are as follows: With respect to Count 9, 20 years of imprisonment, a fine of \$250,000, a term of supervised release of three years and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

With respect to Count 33, five years of

imprisonment, a fine of \$250,000, a term of supervised release of three years and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

If these penalties were imposed consecutively, the maximum penalties would be 25 years of imprisonment, a \$500,000 fine, three years of supervised release and a mandatory special assessment of \$200.

Now, do both of you understand that those are the maximum statutory penalties that could be imposed for the two counts to which you're pleading guilty to, subject to the other conditions which I've described and will describe in a moment.

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, as I mentioned, the agreement is pursuant to 11C, and paragraph two of the agreement on page two states that the Government will recommend that the Court impose a term of imprisonment no greater than 120 months.

And my understanding was, Counsel, that this agreement calls for the Court to agree that I will not impose a term in excess of 120 months, correct?

MR. TRAINI: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Where is that in the agreement?

MR. TRAINI: In paragraph five, your Honor, it states that consistent with 11C that you may accept or reject under the provision of the Rules. So it's our understanding if you accept it, you're accepting the Government's restriction on the cap so that you will be bound not to exceed 120 months at the top, and you can sentence anywhere you want between that and zero.

MR. VILKER: That is correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, what it really says is if I exceed that recommended sentence, then the Defendants are free to withdraw their pleas of guilty.

MR. VILKER: Exactly.

MR. TRAINI: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. So do both of you understand that? If I were to choose to go above the recommended ten years, then each of you would be free to withdraw your pleas of guilty. You understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So in essence, the Court is agreeing to impose a sentence at that agreed-to amount or below, the 120 months or below. Do both of you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, do both of you understand what supervised release is? It's like probation?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, you understand that there'll be a term of supervised release as part of the sentence in this case without any question; and as I mentioned earlier, the maximum term of supervised release would be three years.

Why wouldn't that be six years?

MR. Vilker: Your Honor, it would not be imposed consecutively given the particular statutes. It would be concurrent.

THE COURT: All right. So if the maximum was three years of supervised release, there would be certain conditions imposed as part of that supervised release. You'd be required to follow those conditions, both standard conditions and there likely would be some special conditions. If you fail to comply with supervised release, that could result in additional time in prison. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You also understand there's a

special assessment of \$100 per count that you'd be required to pay. That's \$200 each. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I'm going to ask you a couple of questions about the sentencing guidelines though these questions are somewhat mooted by the agreement with respect to the recommended sentence, but I need to ask you these questions anyway.

Both of you understand and have you had an opportunity to speak with your attorneys about the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and how they work?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You understand that the sentencing guidelines are not mandatory. They are advisory. And what that means is I have to give them serious consideration in determining the appropriate sentence in this case, but I'm not required to follow them. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You understand that anything you've been told about how the sentencing guidelines will

apply to your case are just estimates, that we won't know precisely how they apply to your case until after the Office of Probation conducts a presentence investigation and issues its report. You'll have an opportunity to read that report along with your counsel, file any objections that you believe are appropriate. Once I rule on those objections and set the guideline range, that's when we know how the sentencing guidelines apply to your case. Do you understand all of that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And if it turns out that the sentencing guideline applications are higher than what you thought they were going to be for whatever reason, that does not give you the right to withdraw your plea of guilty. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, you have a number of very important constitutional rights, as you know, that you're giving up by entering a plea of guilty in this case. I'm going to go through those rights with you now. They're contained at paragraph seven of your plea agreements, but I want to go through them with you on

the record.

So first of all, you have the right to plead not guilty and to persist in your plea of not guilty through trial to the jury that's currently impaneled.

Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And in trial, you are presumed to be innocent of the charges against you and it's the Government's burden to prove your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And at trial, you have the right to be represented throughout trial by counsel; you have the right to see and hear all witnesses who would testify against you and to have them cross-examined by your counsel. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And at trial, you would have the right to testify on your own behalf if you wished to do so, or you could decide to not testify, that is, you could exercise your constitutional right to remain silent. Now, if you chose to remain silent and not

testify, the Government could not use your silence against you to try to prove your guilt. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Finally, at trial you'd have the right to use the power of the Court to obtain documents or other items of evidence that you believe might be helpful to your defense, or to compel witnesses to come to Court and testify if you thought that might be helpful to your defense. Do you understand all of that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, by entering these pleas of guilty today, you're giving up all of these rights that I've just described to you and you understand that there will not be or we will not complete the trial in this case. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, in your plea agreements, you understand that you're waiving the right to appeal the sentence that is imposed as long as the sentence is below the recommended sentence of ten years. Do you

understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's paragraph 10 of your plea agreement.

You also both understand that there's no such thing as parole in the federal system; that is, whatever sentence you receive, that's the sentence that you will serve. Do you understand that?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, what I'm going to do at this point is ask Mr. Vilker to come forward, and he's going to put on the record the legal elements that the Government is required to prove with respect to the two counts that you are pleading guilty to, and then he's going to review the agreed-to statement of facts, which has been attached to your plea agreements and which I understand each of you has signed, but we need to put all of that on the record.

So you can sit down when he does this. And Mr. Vilker, you may come forward.

MR. VILKER: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, the Defendants have agreed to plead guilty to one count of wire fraud and one count of

conspiracy. The elements for the wire fraud count, that, first, that there was a scheme substantially as charged in the indictment to defraud or obtain money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses; second, that each Defendant knowingly and willfully participated in this scheme with the intent to defraud; and third, that the Defendants used interstate wires on or about the date alleged in furtherance of the scheme.

The elements of the conspiracy count are:

First, that there was an agreement specified in the indictment and not some other agreement that existed between at least two people to commit the offenses listed in the indictment, which are mail fraud, wire fraud and identity fraud; second, that each Defendant willfully joined in that agreement; and third, that one of the conspirators committed at least one overt act in an effort to further the purpose of the conspiracy.

The statement of facts that are agreed to by the parties are as follows: From in or about 1995 through 2010, Joseph Caramadre ran a company called Estate Planning Resources from offices in Warwick, Providence and Cranston, Rhode Island. Defendant Raymour Radhakrishnan was hired by Mr. Caramadre in July of 2007. In the mid-1990's, Mr. Caramadre developed an investment strategy that depended on the use of

terminally-ill individuals. On his own behalf, and on the behalf of investors, friends and family members, Mr. Caramadre began to purchase from insurance companies products called variable annuities. These annuities offered death benefits upon the death of the person identified as the annuitant. These benefits included a guaranteed return of all the money invested plus, in many instances, a guaranteed profit even if the market went down and various other bonuses and enhancements.

In 2006, Mr. Caramadre began to invest in another financial product that produced substantial profits upon the death of an individual, so-called death-put bonds. Under the terms of these bonds, the owner of the bond is able to redeem the bond years or decades prior to the bond's maturity date upon the death of the bond's co-owner. This investment strategy also depended on the use of terminally-ill individuals.

Beginning in or about July of 2007 and continuing at least through August 2010, Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan did knowingly and willfully conspire with each other and with others to commit mail the fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1341, wire fraud in violation 18 U.S.C. 1343, and identity fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1028(a)(7).

In addition, from 1995 through August 2010, Mr. Caramadre executed a scheme to defraud financial institutions and terminally-ill individuals.

Mr. Radhakrishnan joined the scheme when he was hired by Mr. Caramadre in July 2007.

It was the object of the scheme to defraud and the goal of the conspiracy for Caramadre and Radhakrishnan to fraudulently obtain significant sums of money from the insurance companies and bond issuers. The insurance companies collectively lost millions of dollars from the Defendants' submission of variable annuities utilizing terminally-ill annuitants.

Defendants submitted annuity applications using terminally-ill individuals as annuitants to a number of insurance companies that are identified in the statement of facts agreed upon by the parties.

The bond issuers were required to pay the face value of bonds at a date much earlier than they otherwise would have been required to due to Defendants' exercise of death-put features of the bonds. The Defendants purchased death-put bonds with terminally-ill individuals from a number of companies that are also identified in the statement of facts agreed to by the parties.

Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan fraudulently

obtained millions of dollars by making or causing to be made material misrepresentations and omissions to, first, terminally ill people, their family members and caregivers in order to obtain identity information and signatures for use in furtherance of the scheme; second, insurance companies; and, third, intermediaries, including brokerage houses and broker/dealers.

In order to execute this scheme and conspiracy, Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan fraudulently obtained the identity information of terminally-ill individuals. Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan obtained signatures of numerous terminally-ill individuals on brokerage accounts and annuity opening documents by means of false misrepresentations and omissions.

Mr. Radhakrishnan gave a variety of false explanations as to why the signatures of these terminally-ill individuals were required, including misrepresenting the nature and purpose of the documents the terminally-ill individuals were asked to sign.

Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan concealed from the terminally-ill individuals and their family members that their identities would be used on annuities and bonds that were purchased by

Mr. Caramadre and others. The names of some of the terminally-ill people whose identity information was used by the Defendants without the individual's knowledge and consent include, but are not limited to, Antonio DeCastro, John Lang, Michael Mallane, Vincent Moretti, Pia Bernardo, John Gonsalves, Dennis Flori, Edwin Rodriguez, James Kimball, Robert Cazeault, Hattie Strobel, Charles Perry, Maria Nina, John Kivalos, Augusto Escobar de Rodas, Sonia Gonzalez, Donna Perotta, Richard Wiley, Arthur Culotta, William Hazelwood, Linda Barbeau, Bertha Howard and Bruce Marshall.

It was further part of the scheme to defraud and the conspiracy that Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan took steps that prevented the terminally-ill individuals from understanding the nature of the documents they were signing.

The Defendants typically did not give the terminally-ill people copies of documents they signed or give them time with the documents before signing them.

In addition, Defendants Caramadre and Radhakrishnan often had the terminally-ill individuals sign blank signature pages of application forms without showing them the completed applications.

It was further part of the scheme to fraud and the conspiracy that Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan made and caused to be made material misrepresentations and omissions to various corporate entities, including insurance companies, bonds issuers, broker/dealers and brokerage houses. Defendant Caramadre and his co-conspirators made numerous false representations to insurance companies that some of the annuity owners were friends, clients or acquaintances of the terminally-ill individuals who were named as annuitants.

In addition, Mr. Caramadre took steps to conceal his use of terminally-ill individuals from the insurance companies, including opening annuities with small deposits that would not attract scrutiny, delaying the filing of death claims and opening annuities in the name of Mr. Radhakrishnan when the funds actually belonged to Mr. Caramadre.

In addition, Mr. Caramadre made misrepresentations to representatives of broker/dealer LifeMark concerning the manner in which the annuitants and co-owners of brokerage accounts were identified and whether they were being paid by Mr. Caramadre.

Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan also provided false and fraudulent information concerning

the finances and investment history of many of the terminally-ill individuals listed as co-owners of brokerage accounts. Moreover, from in or about January 2008 to in or about September 2008, Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan made misrepresentations to representatives from brokerage houses concerning the purpose of the numerous joint accounts that had been opened in the names of Mr. Caramadre and other individuals.

Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Radhakrishnan falsely told brokerage house representatives that the co-owners of the accounts were estate planning clients of Mr. Caramadre and that a portion of the investment funds came from the co-owners.

It was a further part of the scheme to defraud and the conspiracy that Mr. Caramadre concealed his true ownership in many of the annuities and bonds by purchasing the annuities and bonds in the names of other individuals, including Mr. Radhakrishnan. With three of the annuities submitted in Mr. Radhakrishnan's name, but with the funds of Mr. Caramadre, Mr. Radhakrishnan misrepresented his income and assets in the suitability forms that accompanied the annuity applications.

Finally, in furtherance of the scheme and

conspiracy, Defendants Caramadre and Radhakrishnan caused to be opened a brokerage account at T.D.

Ameritrade in the names of Mr. Caramadre and Edwin Rodriguez. On or about June 25th of 2008, Defendants Caramadre and Radhakrishnan knowingly transmitted and caused to be transmitted in interstate wire for the purpose of executing the scheme specifically an interstate wire of \$280,000 in funds from the Citizens Bank account of Mr. Caramadre to the Ameritrade account that had been opened in the names of Mr. Caramadre and Mr. Rodriguez.

THE COURT: All right. Will the Defendants please stand.

Now, you heard Mr. Vilker describe the statement of facts, which you've signed, the only difference being that he didn't list the long list of insurance companies and other companies.

So I need to ask you on the record, do each of you agree that these facts are true and these are the facts of the case? Mr. Caramadre?

MR. CARAMADRE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm now going to ask each of you how you wish to plead to these charges, guilty or not guilty? Beginning with you, Mr. Caramadre.

MR. CARAMADRE: Guilty.

MR. RADHAKRISHNAN: Guilty, your Honor.

THE COURT: It is the finding of this Court in the case of the United States versus Joseph Caramadre and Raymour Radhakrishnan that the Defendants are fully competent and capable of entering an informed plea; that the Defendants are aware of the nature of the charges against them and the consequences of their pleas; and their pleas of guilty are knowing and voluntary pleas supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offenses. These pleas are, therefore, accepted, and the Defendants are hereby adjudged guilty of those offenses.

The sentencings in these cases are going to be set down for the time being as follows, with the understanding that these dates may change based on my prior discussion with counsel. These may be viewed as placeholder dates. Friday, February 8th for Mr. Caramadre at 9:00 a.m., this is 2013, obviously; and Friday, February 8, 2013, at 10:00 a.m. for Defendant Radhakrishnan.

Now, between now and the sentencing date, whether it's that date or another, the Office of Probation will be preparing a Presentence Investigation

Report to be used in determining the appropriate sentence in this case, and I want to encourage both of you to cooperate fully with the probation officer in the preparation of that report.

Now, my understanding also is that the Government is agreeable to both of you remaining on your current bail status and that's agreeable to me as well based on my understanding that both of you have been compliant up to this point.

I do want to emphasize to you, though, that your status before the Court has changed. Now you're no longer individuals that have been accused of a crime. You've now been convicted of those crimes. It's very important that you continue to fully comply with all the conditions of your release pending your sentencing; otherwise, I might be in a position where I would have to incarcerate you pending sentence, and I don't want to do that. So make sure you continue to be fully compliant with your conditions of release.

All right. I believe that -- is there anything else?

MR. VILKER: I just have one other thing that I want to say, your Honor. Under the plea agreement, the Government has agreed to dismiss the remaining counts at sentencing. I just wanted to put on the record,

```
1
      because it wasn't contained in the plea agreement, the
 2
      Government also agrees to dismiss the forfeiture
 3
      allegation at the time of sentencing as well.
 4
              THE COURT: All of this will take place at the
 5
      time of sentencing?
              MR. VILKER: Exactly.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Anything else from defense side?
 8
              MR. LEPIZZERA:
                              That was my only point, your
9
      Honor.
10
              MR. THOMPSON:
                             Nothing, your Honor. Thank you.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. Very well.
12
              Charlie, just let the jury know I'm going to
13
      come down and speak to them now.
14
              Okay.
                     Thank you all very much. And thank you
15
      for all of your hard work over the weekend to make this
16
      happen.
17
              (Court concluded at 10:00 a.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION

I, Anne M. Clayton, RPR, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes in the above-entitled case.

/s/ Anne M. Clayton
----Anne M. Clayton, RPR

December 10, 2012

Date